



## COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

17555 Peak Avenue Morgan Hill CA 95037 (408) 779-7247 Fax (408) 779-7236  
Website Address: [www.morgan-hill.ca.gov](http://www.morgan-hill.ca.gov)

### PLANNING COMMISSION *SPECIAL* MEETING MINUTES

**MARCH 18, 2008**

PRESENT: Koepp-Baker, Davenport, Escobar, Mueller, Tanda

ABSENT: Acevedo

LATE: None

STAFF: Community Development Director (CDD) Molloy Previsich, Assistant to the City Manager (ACM) David Heindel, and Minutes Clerk Johnson

Noting the intent to conduct the meeting as a workshop environment, Chair Escobar called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m., and welcomed former Commissioner Lyle. As members of the public came into the room during the evening, they were also acknowledged by the Chair.

#### **DECLARATION OF POSTING OF AGENDA**

Minutes Clerk Johnson certified that the meeting's agenda was duly noticed and posted in accordance with Government Code Section 54954.2.

#### **OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chair Escobar opened, and then closed, the floor to receive comments for items not appearing on the agenda; as there were none present indicating interest in speaking.

#### **CONTINUED ITEM: RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL REGARDING CONTENT OF DRAFT DOWNTOWN SPECIFIC PLAN TO BE ANALYZED IN EIR (THE PREFERRED "PROJECT DESCRIPTION")**

CDD Molloy Previsich reminded that the Commissioners had engaged in discussion at the March 11<sup>th</sup> meeting, but had not yet made recommendations for the Council – and that the purpose of this meeting was to ‘hammer out’ a set of recommendations based on the prepared list of key components of the preliminary Draft Specific Plan (hereafter reference: Plan) to become the DRAFT Downtown Specific Plan that is the subject of EIR. The 2008 Downtown Specific Plan is being crafted to replace the 2003 Downtown Design Plan, providing the General Plan land use designations and policies, zoning, development standards, design guidelines, and implementation strategies.

Noting that there were eleven components of the Plan which had been identified as being necessary to discuss, the following discussion(s) took place:

1. Consideration of Retail Market Demand [central thought: the City requires appropriately-configured spaces as part of mixed use developments; when population and ‘niche success’ are achieved, spaces will be in demand]

- overall market demand projections have been given that are supportable to FY 2030 but space building plan not tied; important to build new buildings which can accommodate retail
- retail trade area identified
- ground floor commercial (importance)
- projections for redevelopment
- parking – potential need for increase; where to build
- questions of need for more aggressive recruitment (of varied market owners)
- 73,000 sf of retail to be shifted to downtown core (net new number)
- placement of businesses must be considered as central to market plans: attraction of similar market vigor {single tenant on end of a block will not provide the ‘draw’ that five merchants will}; involves **zoning and regulating**
- importance of attracting retail from a global area, but always keeping in mind the significance of sequencing / how to achieve

ACM Heindel stressed the importance of creating regulations to ensure the right sizes of space are built, but still providing flexibility. He described this as ‘an on-going evolutionary process’, and the plan will likely be amended from time to time to adjust to market conditions and the reality of what gets developed.

Chair Escobar and Commissioner Mueller led discussion of:

- needing *all* of Morgan Hill to patronize downtown in order for it to succeed
- phased development

ACM Heindel noted that spaces could be designated in specific ways to sell to retailers. “We can sell a vision but retailers are not interested too much in vision. They want to know how much traffic will be on the street, and how many people are in the area to be customers. The density of a ‘day and evening mix’ of retailers to attract as many customers to fill an unmet demand is paramount. Providing a ‘Downtown experience’ of restaurants and specialty retailers is the key for success,” ACM Heindel said. “We must be able to identify and attract successful businesspeople to the downtown and encourage other retailers to position themselves nearby.” ACM Heindel went on to tell of upcoming attendance at International Conference of Shopping Centers (ICSC), where he will work to attract retailers. He stressed the need for the Plan to offer ‘retail flexibility’.

Commissioner Tanda likened the Downtown Plan to that of a very solid sports playing plan. “We will need to look carefully at what is currently downtown and have a game plan that is sound and can accommodate retailers for success,” he said. “We can formulate the plan, but it will be ‘best guesstimates’ of what is needed. The Plan will of necessity, be a ‘living document’ as we really can’t call the need until it comes along.”

Commissioner Mueller spoke on the need to determine the best placement of retail for enhanced synergy. “The key will be: have we identified the best placement for retail? That will enable us to have meaningful input into the spaces to be built,” Commissioner Mueller said.

ACM Heindel spoke to the issue of ownership in the downtown, noting that the Redevelopment Agency had some considerable holdings in the area, but there are many property owned by trusts and multiple persons, which can make decisions and implementation more difficult. “We have the capacity

to plan as the City owns a chunk of the property”.

Chair Escobar commented, “The market takes time to evolve. Currently we may feel there is little in the way for changing.” Mr. Lyle agreed, and urged a ‘clear, exact focus for downtown’. Discussion ensued:

- Downtown should be ‘full service to some degree’; equal focus: restaurants and specialty retail could bring people in
- some streets heavily focused on bringing customers in with parking
- importance of ‘getting things going’: need for flexibility
- Block 20 is currently recommended to be designated medium density multifamily residential; could be consideration of going to higher density R-4. Commissioners’ consensus was to leave it R-3 level of density except for mixed use portion.

Commissioner Mueller stressed the idea: “We are trying to get a Downtown that all residents will use and shop in at some point in time. Once it is decided what will go in specific square footage, the City can market to a wider group and give consideration to the life style of downtown.” Commissioner Tanda commented: “If the City cannot attract customers from outside then we retain only a neighborhood shopping center.”

Chair Escobar emphasized the importance of beginning to ‘lay a basic landscape of how to move forward’. “We need to determine what to move ahead with now,” he said. Discussion evolved regarding the equipping of a mix of retail, parking, and residential in the identified blocks of the Downtown area and included:

- consideration of square footage projections for downtown
- uses for the Albertson’s shopping center (block 20); need for flexibility with an identified ‘place holder’

Commissioner Mueller expressed concern of the ‘disconnect’ of inner block spaces between First and Second Streets, believing that additional retail spaces should be required on those blocks.

Following discussion of uses with retailers of smaller establishments, the Commissioners agreed to support Recommendation # 1: **THAT THE DRAFT PLAN REFLECT A ‘NET NEW’ RETAIL/RESTAURANT OF 110,490 SF WITHIN BLOCKS 1 – 20, REFLECTING A REDUCTION OF BLOCK 20 - WITH THAT REDUCTION OF EXISTING RETAIL ON BLOCK 20 BY THE 2015 TIMEFRAME (73,000 SQ. FT. OF THE EXISTING BLOCK 20 ‘SHIFTS’ TO DOWNTOWN CORE), WITH PUBLIC PARKING SPACE NEEDS CALCULATION TO BE BASED ON THE PROJECTED CUMULATIVE TOTAL COMMERCIAL SPACE NEEDS WITHIN THE DOWNTOWN CORE AREA (BLOCKS 1-14).**

2. Ground Floor Commercial Regulations. Broadening discussion of the recommendation, CDD Molloy Previsich said figure 6 would be revised to show the Ground Floor Zoning Overlay District only;

- with parcels along Monterey between Fourth St. and Main requiring a minimum retail depth of 60 feet, except that all corners of each intersection would require a minimum depth of 80 ft
- parcels along East Third St. between Depot and Monterey to require a minimum of 50 feet, except that all corners of each intersection would require a minimum depth of 80 feet

A diagram highlighting the ‘red areas’ as the basis for 2030 retail projections will become an

explanatory guideline exhibit rather than a zoning overlay, which shows areas where more than 50, 60, and 80 feet would be strongly encouraged, CDD Molloy Previsich explained.

**Recommendation #2 WAS AGREED, AS PRESENTED IN THE ORIGINAL STAFF REPORT: STAFF RECOMMENDS THAT FIGURE 6 BE REVISED TO SHOW GROUND FLOOR ZONING OVERLAY DISTRICT ONLY, WITH PARCELS ALONG MONTEREY BETWEEN 4<sup>TH</sup> STREET AND MAIN AVENUE TO REQUIRE A MINIMUM RETAIL DEPTH OF 60 FEET, EXCEPT AT ALL CORNERS OF EACH INTERSECTION WOULD REQUIRE A MINIMUM RETAIL DEPTH OF 80 FEET; AND PARCELS ALONG THIRD STREET BETWEEN DEPOT AND MONTEREY TO REQUIRE A MINIMUM DEPTH OF 50 FEET, EXCEPT THAT ALL CORNERS OF EACH INTERSECTION WOULD REQUIRE A MINIMUM DEPTH OF 80 FEET. A DIAGRAM SHOWING THE RED AREAS SHOWING THE BASIS FOR THE 2030 RETAIL PROJECTIONS WILL BECOME AN EXPLANATORY/GUIDELINE EXHIBIT RATHER THAN A ZONING OVERLAY, WITH SHOWS AREAS WHERE MORE THAN 50, 60 AND 80 FEET WOULD BE STRONGLY ENCOURAGED.**

3. 2015 And 2030 Redevelopment Projections. CDD Molloy Previsich presented an overview of what the projections were and how they were developed. The various blocks intended for development in the targeted areas were identified.

Discussion ensued as to:

- assumed development of office space at the Britton School site rather than retail.
- how much of this plan will the EIR cover? CDD Molloy Previsich stated the intent to identify the overall projected amount of development on blocks 1 – 20 and have the EIR study that, along with the assumed public projects such as parking
- explanation of not including a “10% margin” in the projections, which the Commission agreed with
- assumption that all existing parking on Monterey would remain as existing
- parking monitoring strategy to be needed

The Commissioners agreed with **Recommendation # 3: THE 2030 REDEVELOPMENT PROJECTION CHARTS AND TEXT BE REVISED TO REMOVE THE ‘10% MARGIN’; THAT BLOCK 19 BE PROJECTED FOR OFFICE MIXED USE RATHER THAN RETAIL MIXED USE, AND THAT BLOCK 20 BE INCLUDED WITHIN THE PROJECTIONS FOR THE 2015 REDEVELOPMENT PHASE.**

4. Parking Supply Needs, Timing and Locations CDD Molloy Previsich said that the parking supply numbers in the Plan and in the staff report did not count VTA/Caltrain lot, the new Courthouse lot, or the Community Center spaces. The changes that have occurred on Depot have been accounted for, and the planned changes and reduced numbers on on-street spaces on Third Street were also assumed. Status quo would be assumed for Monterey Road. Suggested parking space requirements for residential units were explained and discussed in detail:

- 1 parking space on site for units of 600 sf or less
- 1.5 spaces on site for units between 601 and 1,350 sf
- 2 spaces on site for units of more than 1,350 sf
- no residential guest parking requirement (included within above; guest spaces beyond that would use general public parking supply)

CDD Molloy Previsich went on to examine with the Commissioners present:

- prioritization for the uses of Redevelopment Agency funds to acquire and improve public parking spaces so that spaces are available prior to occupancy of new developments
- increase parking supply by at least 500 parking spaces by 2015
- implement a parking monitoring program to ensure parking is added when occupancies are approaching 92%

Commissioner Tanda asked for clarification of the reasoning for not using the VTA and Courthouse parking. That led to discussion of:

- at-grade pedestrian crossing at Depot and Plaza to begin in April 2008.
- potential rail usage (double-tracking and possible high speed rail)
- some preference for underground crossing (the sooner, the better: Commissioner Mueller) with suggestion of two underground crossings: undercrossing for more convenience
- need mass transit for viable reduction of parking downtown

Commissioner Davenport: not in favor of an at-grade crossing, and said, “If there were a below grade walkway, the City could viably count VTA for parking.”

Commissioner Mueller: “Not downtown on weekdays or weekends.

CDD Molloy Previsich: VTA may consider a transit-oriented residential development over the parking lot at the site; it is proposed to rezone the site to allow that.

Commissioner Davenport said, “I could see a multilevel parking structure built nearby.”

Chair Escobar: timeframe of 500 spaces by 2015 appears to be a reasonable goal; in most of downtowns, parking is usually on opposite side of main strip and that may be the only place here, keeping in mind that our downtown is only four blocks long

CDD Molloy Previsich: supply opportunities have been identified along Depot and elsewhere; the plan is for the City to purchase parking sites and help improve existing sites.

Commissioner Davenport: there is need for multilevel parking on blocks 7 and 8

CDD Molloy Previsich told where the City owns or is pursuing ownership on blocks 6, 7, and 8 explaining the potential for parking at those locations; she also said she was unaware of any reluctance by the City to construct parking structures. “However, we do not want to oversupply parking.

Commissioner Mueller: concern about proximity problem; in the short term the City needs enough parking and having 15% more than the known standard would not be ‘a bad thing’

Commissioner Davenport: private parking lots e.g. block 4 for residents of area (multilevel parking with restricted / preferred parking with public parking)

After further discussion and a decision to add a monitoring requirement, the Commission by consensus agreed to the following modified staff recommendation regarding **#4 PARKING SUPPLY NEEDS, TIMING AND LOCATIONS: BASE THE PARKING SUPPLY STRATEGY ON A 92% OCCUPANCY FACTOR FOR PUBLIC PARKING AVAILABLE FOR BOTH RETAIL AND OFFICE USES IN THE CORE BLOCKS 1 – 14 (NO ON-SITE PARKING REQUIREMENT), BASED ON THE REVISED 2030 REDEVELOPMENT PROJECTION. FOR RESIDENTIAL UNITS, REQUIRE 1.0 SPACES ON SITE FOR UNITS OF 600 SF OR LESS, 1.5 SPACES ON SITE FOR UNITS BETWEEN 601 AND 1,350 SF, AND 2.0 SPACES ON SITE FOR UNITS OF MORE THAN 1,350 SF, WITH NO RESIDENTIAL GUEST PARKING REQUIREMENT. PRIORITIZE USE OF REDEVELOPMENT FUNDS TO ACQUIRE AND IMPROVE PUBLIC PARKING SPACES SO THAT SPACES ARE AVAILABLE PRIOR TO OCCUPANCY OF NEW DEVELOPMENTS, AND INCREASE PUBLIC PARKING SUPPLY BY AT LEAST 500 PARKING SPACES BY 2015. IMPLEMENT A PARKING MONITORING PROGRAM TO**

**ENSURE PARKING IS ADDED WHEN OCCUPANCIES ARE APPROACHING 92%.  
INCLUDE A PROPOSAL FOR A GRADE-SEPARATED PEDESTRIAN CROSSING OVER  
THE RAILROAD TRACKS.**

Regarding public transit use, Chair Escobar provided information that - in general - this last quarter has shown an increase for VTA ridership in all sectors. He went on to tell of the plan for VTA to - within the next few weeks - have a Commercial Development Officer in the quest to pursue transit-oriented developments. "Also, the 168 express bus is reaching capacity. While there is not a specific plan for implementation at this time, we are looking to November with a proposed 1/8 cent sales tax. In San Jose, there has been a redesign of service focused on already 'good lines', adding fleet vehicles and increasing ridership. The total redesign timeline is not yet available as the cost of gas is big variable with further study ongoing," he said.

Commissioner Davenport commented the City now has a unique opportunity for critical thinking of how to solve bottlenecks in morning and evenings and how to deal with those issues. "Currently what we have is not the best for the public," he said.

Mr. Lyle noted, "We may need to change way of thinking about the variables. This is a jump start. There is incentive for plan evaluation every five years – and the City may change priorities at each evaluation."

5. Changes to Preliminary Draft Land Use Recommendations. Discussions centered on preferences for uses at various locations, and the importance of identifying prospects for all types of viable businesses. As to land use, discussion centered on the new CBD district, potential for PD overlays, CCR districts, and the need to be specific as to the core downtown area. Suggestion/discussion of specific uses included:

- offices
- restaurants
- amounts of density
- mixed use with retail
- mixed use with office only
- area east of tracks in downtown: many opportunity sites associated with downtown
- Britton site projected for office & residential mixed use
- "Albertson's" shopping center redevelopment assumption: land use west of creek easement: multifamily medium density; other side mixed use
- availability of land for affordable units
- concern with competition
- districts not requiring mixed use
- potential for leveraged zoning with VTA
- target areas for teachers
- Granary Block: whether to remove Main Street retail projection (consensus to remove, and shift the assumed square footage to Block 2)
- Block 18: change from mixed use; zone Mama Mias commercial; residential area zone R-3 residential; other sites office
- Block 10 and 11 makes reference to east – really want west
- how far down First and Second should the City go for retail to be revised

By consensus, the Commission agreed on the following recommendation regarding **#5 CHANGES TO PRELIMINARY DRAFT LAND USE RECOMMENDATIONS: REVISE FIGURES 4, 5, AND 6**

**TO REFLECT THE RECOMMENDED CHANGED (SEE STAFF REPORT AND ABOVE SUMMARY) TO GENERAL PLAN, ZONING AND GROUND FLOOR OVERLAY PROVISIONS AS DETAILED FOR BLOCKS 1 – 20. REFLECT WITHIN THE DISCUSSIONS OF EACH BLOCK THE “STRONGLY ENCOURAGED”; AND “OPPORTUNITY FOR” STATEMENTS AS DETAILED IN THE MARCH 11, 2008 PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT.**

6. Density, FAR, and Height CDD Molloy Previsich advised that the 2008 Downtown Specific Plan does not “re-vision” the downtown; the vision statement developed by the Task Force for the Downtown Plan of 2003 is still the vision statement for the 2008 Plan with very minor changes. The reason the City is making changes to the Plan is to increase the feasibility of actually attaining the community’s vision for downtown. A new Central Business District zoning would allow greater changes of density, FAR, and height, but those would not extend to the neighborhoods east of Monterey toward Del Monte. Four story buildings (with a fourth floor setback) would be allowed on sites of one-half acre or more, such as the Sunsweet site.

Considerable debate raged regarding this issue, particularly the suggestion of four-story buildings. Statements made included:

- really would be making big change to the character of downtown
- flat roofed four stories would be more viable for mixed use in some blocks
- in blocks 3 & 4 four stories maybe, but not in other areas
- concern of density downtown
- downtown population to grow in order to achieve density needed for viable downtown businesses
- West 3<sup>rd</sup> Street and West 4<sup>th</sup> Street shown as “grid streets”; need to correct to show reality
- paths along river walk
- opening up River for pedestrian walkway

After the discussion, the Commission agreed to support the staff recommendation regarding #6 **DENSITY, FAR AND HEIGHT**, with a noted expression of Commissioner Mueller’s concern about four-story heights: **RETAIN THE FARs AND HEIGHT LIMITS AS PROPOSED BY THE PRELIMINARY DRAFT SPECIFIC PLAN WITHIN THE DOWNTOWN CORE, AS WELL AS THE LANGUAGE THAT WOULD ALLOW FOR PLANNED DEVELOPMENT (PD) ZONING APPLICATIONS TO MODIFY FAR, DENSITY AND HEIGHT STANDARDS, IF DETERMINED CONSISTENT WITH THE INTENT, GOALS AND POLICIES OF THE ADOPTED SPECIFIC PLAN. INCLUDE POLICY LANGUAGE WITHIN THE PLAN THAT SUGGESTS THAT TWO KEY SITES THAT COULD ACCOMMODATE GREATER HEIGHTS WOULD BE ON BLOCKS 3 AND 4, BETWEEN MONTEREY AND DEPOT. GREATER INTENSITY OF DEVELOPMENT ON THESE LARGE KEY SITES COULD ACT AS A DOWNTOWN LANDMARK, WITHOUT INTERFERING WITH THE PREDOMINATELY 2- AND 3- STORY CHARACTER DESIRED FOR DEVELOPMENT ALONG MONTEREY ROAD ITSELF.**

7. Ballot Measure regarding RDCS Provisions for Downtown. Turning to the possibility of a ballot measure since the RCDS is set to retire in 2020, Commissioner Mueller said, “I don’t see the need for a ballot measure in the near future. We should just stay in it and consider set-asides for the downtown when the subcommittee revamps the scoring criteria.”

Chair Escobar observed, “When items are sent out for bid - and government usually is asked to take

the lowest bidder – well, in this case we may not want the lowest but may want to add amenities so it would be possible/necessary to negotiate with the responders then select those best suited for the job. There are very special need constraints under the existing RDCE ordinance. I am not convinced we can do that under an RDCE Ordinance.”

CDD Molloy Previsich noticed that the recommendation contains mention of 500 allotments available without a competition for Downtown Core mixed use projects. Those type of projects are the most difficult to have happen due to financing and the need to construct in one phase rather than over time. The fact that these types of projects would be constructed downtown would be the “community benefit”. There is more to be gained without a competition than with a competition, as RDCE acts as a disincentive to developing projects.

Mr. Lyle suggested that not changes to RDCE were needed at this time; it would be better to ‘deal with the issues before 2014 or 2016 at the very latest’. “I don’t think the City should look at RDCE to 2020 and then let it suddenly end. We have deal with the 2020 end of Measure C well before 2020, probably in 2014 or 2015 for a decision of whether to end it sooner, or to continue it longer,” he said. If the City wants to make changes, there might be high risk to say the future of downtown depends on passing a ballot measure. If the City starts to have an election every couple of years, people start to get nervous about what is going on. In the interim, we need to consider what can be done with the criteria and timing for the set-sides. Perhaps it would be wise to get a new General Plan in order, and then have a ballot measure.

Commissioner Koepp-Baker expressed concern that if a ballot measure failed, the City might have little recourse to seek better action. Commissioner Tanda suggested it might be important to ascertain how the City’s Administration would view a ballot measure on this issue.

CDD Molloy Previsich observed that mixed use projects are difficult enough to get done without the added difficulty of RDCE. There are lots of options for the specific content of a ballot measure, and more discussion over the coming months could lead to a good proposal.

Chair Escobar said, “On the other hand, if a ballot measure were rejected, then it could be argued that the downtown might not be all that important to residents.”

CDD Molloy Previsich said, “A ballot measure should not be rushed, and probably November 2008 is premature. I suggest we let ACM Heindel do his work, better define the need to the community, and then in March of 2009 or some later time place a measure on the ballot.”

Mr. Lyle said, “The biggest problem with RDCE is timing issues. Timing helps some, but not others.”

Commissioner Mueller noted that the Commission has plenty of latitude to deal with the issues, and at this time the latitude should not include a ballot measure. Commissioner Davenport agreed, saying, “A ballot measure would be premature. We have other methods we can use.”

Commissioner Tanda stated, “There are tangible ways to treat downtown as being special. Certainly people should be allowed to vote. However, the ballot measure needs to be very articulated, and we are not there yet.”

Concerning the ballot measure recommendation #7, **BALLOT MEASURE REGARDING RDCE PROVISIONS FOR DOWNTOWN**, the Commissioners declined to forward a recommendation to the



City Council, instead preferring that their varying perspectives be provided for Council consideration:

***Commissioners Escobar and Tanda:*** These Commissioners supported the staff recommendation to modify/exempt downtown mixed use projects from the RDCS, and believed that the City Council should make the political decision about the timing and specific content of a ballot measure.

***Commissioners Mueller and Davenport:*** A ballot measure is premature in the near future; and these Commissioners are skeptical of whether it is necessary, as it should be able to be managed by creation of competition categories, set-asides, and point criteria etc within the RDCS system.

***Commissioner Koeppe-Baker:*** She could see that a ballot measure may be needed at some point, but the timing and content needed to be thought through very carefully. She thinks it would be important that the “markets are ready to go” – i.e. that the community/voters can see that there is a real need to remove the constraint to development.

8. Downtown Affordable Housing and Housing Element RHNA. CDD Molloy Previsich explained that, on the subject of affordable housing, the intent was to convey the idea that HCD accepts density levels as part of the addressing Fair Share Housing allocations, and accepts even market rate units as accommodating various income levels. Not all “affordable” units need to be deed-restricted. Particularly for rental housing, market-rate rentals do typically accommodate very low, low and moderate income households.

Mr. Lyle noted the assumption that rentals will be affordable.

Commissioner Mueller stated concern of increased rentals.

There was discussion of the BMR requirements in the downtown area.

CDD Molloy Previsich made it known that the City is thinking of changes to the Below Market Rate (BMR) housing program. The staff recommendation for downtown is that rental units would be exempted from any formal BMR or inclusionary housing requirements, but 15% of owner-occupied, for-sale housing units must be affordable to households at or below moderate income, with those units to be deed-restricted.

Commissioners said they thought there would be merit in having a City requirement of not requiring deed restricted rental units for downtown, and in fact exempting rental units throughout the City could be a good idea. Commissioner Tanda urged an analysis before final acceptance. Commissioner Koeppe-Baker stressed the need to make certain that the City would not lose any subsidy if changes were made.

Regarding staff recommendation **#8 DOWNTOWN AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND HOUSING ELEMENT RHNA**, the Commission, by consensus, decided to change the staff recommendation, to **RECOMMEND THAT DOWNTOWN PROJECTS SHOULD FOLLOW THE SAME STANDARDS AND REQUIREMENTS FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING AS ANY OTHER PROJECTS IN THE CITY; AND THAT THE CITY SHOULD CONSIDER A NEW POLICY TO NOT REQUIRE RESTRICTED AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS FOR RENTAL PROJECTS.**

9. Monterey Road. CDD Molloy Previsich said the Plan proposal for reduction of travel lanes from four lanes to two will be analyzed by the citywide Master Transportation Analysis and in the Downtown Specific Plan EIR. Discussion ensued, noting possible controversy and some believe that it's mostly downtown business owners that are supportive of the narrowing plan.

Regarding traffic calming, Commissioner Tanda said that he has worked with this concept in the past, and noticed that this street would lend itself well to narrowing, but is not a prime spot for "speed bump" traffic calming measure installations. There would need to be analysis of where the lane reduction would start; where traffic would be shifted to the parallel Santa Teresa and Butterfield routes.

Commissioner Davenport and Commissioner Koepp-Baker led discussion in a comparison of Monterey Road (being narrowed) to downtown Livermore, which they both described as having a 'very much alive downtown'.

By consensus, the Commission agreed with staff recommendation **#9 MONTEREY ROAD: RETAIN THE SPECIFIC PLAN PROPOSAL TO NARROW MONTEREY ROAD FROM 4 TO 2 LANES, AND DIRECT THE MASTER TRANSPORTATION IMPACT ANALYSIS AND CIRCULATION ELEMENT ASSESSMENT TO DETERMINE THE FEASIBILITY OF THE CONCEPT AND WHAT ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS ARE NECESSARY PRIOR TO IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NARROWING, TO SHIFT MONTEREY TRAFFIC TO PARALLEL NORTH-SOUTH ROUTES. ALSO, EMPHASIZE IN THE SPECIFIC PLAN THAT THE LANE REDUCTION WILL BE IMPLEMENTED ON A TEMPORARY TRIAL BASIS PRIOR TO A FINAL COMMITMENT TO THE PROJECT.**

10. Plan Boundaries. CDD Molloy Previsich noted that the Specific Plan boundaries include Blocks 1 – 18, which is a smaller area than the "Downtown RDCS Competition Boundary" established by the City Council a few years ago. She is recommending retaining the Specific Plan boundaries rather than enlarging them, since that is where the mixed use projects would be concentrated that relate to the possible ballot measure. However, the recommended land use changes for Blocks 19 and 20 should be covered by the Downtown Plan EIR and processed concurrent with the Specific Plan.

By consensus, the Commission agreed with staff recommendation **#10 PLAN BOUNDARIES: RETAIN THE EXISTING BOUNDARIES, BUT PROCESS AND ADOPT THE LAND USE CHANGES THAT ARE RECOMMENDED FOR BLOCKS 19 AND 20, AND THE CC-R ZONING DISTRICT, CONCURRENT WITH THE SPECIFIC PLAN; INCLUDING ANALYSIS BY THE EIR.**

11. Refinement of Other Zoning District Development Standards and Miscellaneous Plan Modifications. CDD Molloy Previsich explained this category is 'basically a catch all' wherein staff would be authorized to continue to make refinements for the Draft Plan, to incorporate other factors suggested at public workshops etc, but which aren't major components of the Plan as far as EIR analysis goes. She cited examples of clarifying development standards such as lot sizes in certain existing zoning districts, and emphasizing support for shifting the bus route from Monterey to Depot.

Commissioner Mueller urged 'some dialogue with the Planning Commission so there is not a great amount of catch-up detail at the end of the process and working toward refinement without going into the EIR'.

Commissioner Tanda reminded of issues raised at the January 27, 2008 Commission meeting:

▫ transit matters requiring more discussion and policy to be put into the Draft Plan  
(CDD Molloy Previsich advised that the 'catch all #11' would be the place for that, and that probably no further recommendation needed to be made for #11.

The Commission and CDD Molloy Previsich agreed to schedule Commission discussion sessions on continued refinement of the Draft Specific Plan document during May and June 2008, to meet the objective of re-publishing a Draft Plan in July and releasing it along with the Draft EIR.

By consensus, the Commission agreed with staff recommendation #11 ***REFINEMENT OF OTHER ZONING DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS AND MISCELLANEOUS PLAN MODIFICATIONS: AUTHORIZE STAFF TO CONTINUE TO MAKE PLAN REFINEMENTS THAT WOULD BE INCORPORATED INTO THE REVISED DRAFT DOWNTOWN SPECIFIC PLAN, WHICH WOULD BE PUBLISHED AND AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC AT THE SAME TIME AS THE DRAFT EIR IS AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC REVIEW AND COMMENT IN JULY 2008.***

Having covered all 11 recommendations, with thorough discussion and limited modifications (noted in these minutes), Chair Escobar declared the special meeting adjourned at 11:22 p.m.

**MINUTES PREPARED BY:**

---

**JUDI H. JOHNSON, Minutes Clerk**